



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/807,574      | 06/22/2001  | Henry C. Yuen        | 36179/WWM/11        | 9100             |

7590 10/20/2006

Alexander Shvarts  
Fish & Neave  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020-1105

EXAMINER

SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                       |                |  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.       | Applicant(s)   |  |
|                              | 09/807,574            | YUEN, HENRY C. |  |
|                              | Examiner              | Art Unit       |  |
|                              | Dominic D. Saltarelli | 2623           |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 20-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 20-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 21, 2006 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-16, and 20-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims \*\*\* are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson et al. (US 2003/0110499 A1) [Knudson] in view of Zigmond et al. (6,698,020) [Zigmond].

Regarding claims 1 and 15, Knudson discloses a method and system for targeting advertisements to television viewers (paragraph 0008) that have a television receiver (fig. 1, set top 48) and a television screen (fig. 1, television 52), the method comprising the steps of:

displaying an EPG on the television screen (figs. 4-15 and 17-21), wherein EPG data is stored in an EPG data base (fig. 1, program guide database 34);

monitoring use of the EPG (fig. 3, "determine user preferences by monitoring user interactions with program guide" 60);

developing a viewer profile based on viewer usage of the EPG using data from the EPG data base (paragraphs 0057-0058 and 0071-0072);

receiving a plurality of advertisements with a television signal at the receiver (paragraph 0054); and

displaying one of the stored advertisements on the screen in the EPG (figs. 4-15 and 17-21, and paragraph 0087).

Knudson fails to disclose selectively storing fewer than all of the received advertisements at the receiver depending on the viewer profile.

In an analogous art, Zigmond teaches selectively storing fewer than all of received advertisements at a receiver depending on a viewer profile in order to conserve memory in the receiver (col. 15, lines 17-34).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Knudson to include selectively storing fewer than all of received advertisements at a receiver depending on a

viewer profile, as taught by Zigmond, for the benefit of conserving memory in the receiver.

Regarding claim 3, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the received advertisements are embedded in a television signal (Knudson, paragraphs 0044-0046).

Regarding claim 4, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 3, wherein the receiver receives an analog broadcast, and the received advertisements are embedded in the VBI (Zigmond, col. 16, lines 44-56).

Regarding claim 5, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 3, wherein the television signal is formatted as a digital video stream, wherein the received advertisements are embedded in the video stream (digital satellite broadcast, Zigmond, col. 17 line 50 – col. 18 line 6).

Regarding claims 7, 11, 12, and 13, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the EPG database includes the time, channel, and program category identifiers of telecast television programs (Knudson, paragraph 0089), the EPG displaying step permits viewers to highlight displayed program listings to initiate another action (as shown in fig. 15 of Knudson, highlighted region 192 used for program selection), and the monitoring step retrieves the

Art Unit: 2623

program categories of telecast television programs selected by the viewer for display on the screen from the EPG database by addressing the time and channel of such selected television programs (Knudson, broadcast time tag 286 and channel tag 284, shown in fig. 27, see paragraph 0089).

Regarding claim 16, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the system of claim 15, wherein the system is comprised in the television receiver (Zigmond, col. 7, lines 37-67).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson and Zigmond as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dedrick (5,724,521, of record).

Regarding claim 6, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 1, but fail to disclose maintaining the viewer profile in a secure file at the receiver.

In an analogous art, Dedrick teaches storing person profile information in a secure file (profile is encrypted to protect it from being accessed by any other user, col. 7, lines 37-49), preventing access to sensitive information that may be in the user's profile (col. 7, lines 16-25 lines 37-49).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Knudson and Zigmond to include maintaining the viewer profile in a secure file at the receiver, as taught by

Art Unit: 2623

Dedrick, for the benefit of protecting the viewer related information stored in the profile.

6. Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson and Zigmond as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lawler (5,758,259).

Regarding claim 8, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 7, but fail to disclose the monitoring step additionally records the time that programs in each category are displayed such that the storing step stores an advertisement that matches the category having the longest recorded time.

In an analogous art, Lawler discloses a method for tracking viewer preferences to assist in the selection of content (col. 8, lines 51-62) that records the time that programs in different categories are displayed (col. 7 line 44 - col. 8 line 34, where each count represents a recorded minimum of time spent viewing the program, col. 7, lines 47-50, thus the highest count represents the longest recorded time).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Knudson and Zigmond to include recording the time that programs in each category are displayed to assist in the creation of a user profile used for the selection of content, as taught by Lawler, such that the storing step stores an advertisement that matches the category having the

longest recorded time (those advertisements categorized under categories with the highest count are considered to be of most interest).

Regarding claim 14, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 13, but fail to teaches the monitoring step counts by category the number of times the other action is initiated.

In an analogous art, Lawler discloses a method for tracking viewer preferences to assist in the selection of content (col. 8, lines 51-62) that counts by category the viewing of different programming (col. 7 line 44 - col. 8 line 34).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Knudson and Zigmond to include counts by category the number of times the other action is initiated, as taught by Lawler, for the benefit of providing an additional factor to assist in creating a more accurate profile of a viewer used in the selection of advertisements.

7. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson and Zigmond as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Young et al. (5,353,121, of record) [Young].

Regarding claim 9, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 7, but fail to disclose the EPG displaying step uses the same program category identifiers to compile category program guides.



In an analogous art, Young teaches compiling category program guides for display in an EPG (figs. 14-17), for the benefit of providing theme based guides to assist users in locating desired programming.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Knudson and Zigmond to include compiling category program guides, as taught by Young, wherein the displaying step uses the same program category identifiers to perform said compiling (movies, sport, specials, and TV fare are used consistently, shown in figs. 14 through 17 of Young).

Regarding claim 10, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the method of claim 7, but fail to disclose the EPG displaying step uses different program category identifiers to compile category program guides.

In an analogous art, Young teaches compiling category program guides for display in an EPG (figs. 14-17), for the benefit of providing theme based guides to assist users in locating desired programming.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Knudson and Zigmond to include compiling category program guides, as taught by Young, wherein the displaying step uses different program category identifiers to perform said compiling (the different category identifiers include movies, sport, specials, and TV fare, shown in figs. 14 through 17 of Young).

8. Claims 20, 21, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson in view of Zigmond and Dedrick.

Regarding claims 20 and 24, Knudson discloses a method and system of collecting viewer profile data for a television receiver comprising:

displaying an EPG on the television screen (figs. 4-15 and 17-21), wherein EPG data is stored in an EPG data base (fig. 1, program guide database 34);

monitoring use of the EPG (fig. 3, "determine user preferences by monitoring user interactions with program guide" 60);

developing a viewer profile based on viewer usage of the EPG using data from the EPG data base (paragraphs 0057-0058 and 0071-0072);

receiving a plurality of advertisements with a television signal at the receiver (paragraph 0054); and

displaying one of the stored advertisements on the screen in the EPG (figs. 4-15 and 17-21, and paragraph 0087).

Knudson fails to disclose storing the viewer profile in a secure file and selectively storing fewer than all of the received advertisements at the receiver depending on the viewer profile.

In an analogous art, Zigmond teaches selectively storing fewer than all of received advertisements at a receiver depending on a viewer profile in order to conserve memory in the receiver (col. 15, lines 17-34).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Knudson to include selectively storing fewer than all of received advertisements at a receiver depending on a viewer profile, as taught by Zigmond, for the benefit of conserving memory in the receiver.

Knudson and Zigmond fail to disclose storing the viewer profile in a secure file.

In an analogous art, Dedrick teaches storing person profile information in a secure file (profile is encrypted to protect it from being accessed by any other user, col. 7, lines 37-49), preventing access to sensitive information that may be in the user's profile (col. 7, lines 16-25 lines 37-49).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Knudson and Zigmond to include maintaining the viewer profile in a secure file, as taught by Dedrick, for the benefit of protecting the viewer related information stored in the profile.

Regarding claims 21 and 25, Knudson, Zigmond, and Dedrick disclose the method and system of claims 20 and 24, but fail to disclose storing the results further comprises storing the results in a secure file in which the data cannot be accessed from outside the television receiver.

It is notoriously well known in the art to restrict access to profile data stored in a receiver to any device other than the receiver, protecting the user's

Art Unit: 2623

personal information stored in said profile from being accessed and stolen by an outside entity, such as storing the profile in separate section of memory or as a hidden file that is inaccessible from any computer connected to the receiver over a network.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Knudson, Zigmond, and Dedrick to include storing the results in a secure file in which the data cannot be access from outside the television receiver, protecting the user's personal information stored in said profile from being accessed and stolen by a malicious outside entity.

9. Claims 22, 23, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson, Zigmond, and Dedrick as applied to claims 20 and 24 above, and further in view of O'Flaherty et al. (6,253,203, of record) [O'Flaherty].

Regarding claims 22 and 26, Knudson, Zigmond, and Dedrick disclose the method and system of claims 20 and 24, but fail to disclose storing the results further comprises storing the results in a secure file from which only anonymous data can be accessed from outside the television receiver.

In an analogous art, O'Flaherty teaches restricting access by third parties to a locally stored database to only being able to access anonymous data for the benefit of enhancing privacy of personalized information yet maintaining

controlled access to the data for the benefit of the third parties (col. 4, lines 30-53).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system disclosed by Knudson, Zigmond, and Dedrick to include a secure file from which only anonymous data can be accessed from the outside, as taught by O'Flaherty, for the benefit of enhancing privacy of personalized information yet maintaining controlled access to the data for the benefit of interested third parties.

Regarding claims 23 and 27, Knudson, Zigmond, Dedrick, and O'Flaherty disclose the method and system of claims 22 and 26, wherein the anonymous data is accessed from outside the television receiver by telephone (Zigmond reports data from a receiver to a statistics collection location using phone lines, col. 10, lines 4-15).

10. Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson and Zigmond as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Marsh et al. (5,848,397, of record) [Marsh].

Regarding claims 28 and 29, Knudson and Zigmond disclose the system and method of claims 1 and 15, but fail to disclose the advertisement is selected from the sub-plurality of advertisements according to a rotation.

Art Unit: 2623

In an analogous art, Marsh teaches displaying selected advertisements according to a rotation (col. 9, lines 7-27), for the benefit of maintaining a fair distribution of the display of advertisements (col. 9, lines 50-64).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Knudson and Zigmond to include selecting the advertisements according to a rotation, as taught by Marsh, for the benefit of maintaining a fair distribution of the display of advertisements.

11. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudson, Zigmond, and Dedrick as applied to claims 20 and 24 above, and further in view of Marsh.

Regarding claims 30 and 31, Knudson, Zigmond, and Dedrick disclose the system and method of claims 20 and 24, but fail to disclose the advertisement is selected from the sub-plurality of advertisements according to a rotation.

In an analogous art, Marsh teaches displaying selected advertisements according to a rotation (col. 9, lines 7-27), for the benefit of maintaining a fair distribution of the display of advertisements (col. 9, lines 50-64).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method and system of Knudson, Zigmond, and Dedrick to include selecting the advertisements according to a rotation, as taught by Marsh, for the benefit of maintaining a fair distribution of the display of advertisements.

Art Unit: 2623

### ***Conclusion***

12. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

### **Certificate of Mailing**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Registration Number: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Certificate of Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Registration Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2623

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dominic D. Saltarelli whose telephone number is (571) 272-7302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dominic Saltarelli  
Patent Examiner  
Art Uni 2611

DS



JOHN MILLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600